

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

VOL. 4.—NO. 22.

SALEM, OHIO, FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 1849.

WHOLE NO. 178.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE

Is published every Friday, at Salem, Columbia Co., Ohio, by the Executive Committee of the Western Anti-Slavery Society; and is the only paper in the Great West which advocates secession from pro-slavery governments and pro-slavery church organizations. It is edited by BENJAMIN S. and J. ELIZABETH JONES; and while urging upon the people the duty of holding "No union with slaveholders," either in Church or State, as the only consistent position an Abolitionist can occupy, and as the best means for the destruction of slavery; it will, so far as its limits permit, give a history of the daily progress of the anti-slavery cause—exhibit the policy and practice of slaveholders, and by facts and arguments endeavor to increase the zeal and activity of every true lover of Freedom. In addition to its anti-slavery matter, it will contain general news, choice extracts, moral tales, &c. It is to be hoped that all the friends of the Western Anti-Slavery Society—all the advocates of the Disunion movement, will do what they can to aid in the support of the paper, by extending its circulation. You who live in the West should sustain the paper that is published in your midst. The Bugle is printed on an imperial sheet, and subscribers may take their choice of the following

TERMS.

\$1.50 per annum, if paid within the first six months of the subscriber's year. If paid before three months of the year has expired, a deduction of 25 cents will be made, reducing the price to \$1.25.

If payment be made in advance, or on the receipt of the first number, 50 cents will be deducted, making the subscription but \$1.

To any person wishing to examine the character of the paper, it will be furnished 6 months, for 50 cents in advance; to all others 75 cents will be charged.

No deviation from these terms.

We occasionally send numbers to those who are not subscribers, but who are believed to be interested in the dissemination of anti-slavery truth, with the hope that they will either subscribe themselves, or use their influence to extend its circulation among their friends.

Communications intended for insertion to be addressed to the Editors. All others to the Publishing Agent, JAMES BARNARD.

Speech of J. R. Giddings.

The following extracts are from the speech of J. R. Giddings, made in Congress on the 6th inst., on a motion to reconsider the vote on the bill providing for the payment of the slave of Antonio Pacheco.

Mr. GIDDINGS said, that when on a former day he yielded the floor for an adjournment, he was saying that great and important principles lay at the foundation of our Government. Those who formed it declared the object and ulterior design of this and of all civilized governments. That design was, "to insure to all men (residing under our jurisdiction) the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Are we to-day (said he) carrying out these objects? Here, sir, are two hundred and thirty American statesmen legislating for the benefit of slavery. There is no evading this plain and obvious fact. No subterfuge can hide it from the people. The powers of government were instituted by our patriot fathers, for the express purpose of securing to all for whom we legislate the blessings of liberty. We are now sitting here to compensate the oppressor of his fellow-man for his inability to continue his power over the victim of his barbarous capidity. The members who vote for this bill will give unmistakable evidence of their approval of slavery, and their willingness to sustain it.

After the close of the late war with England, a bill was pending in this House, providing for the payment of property lost or destroyed during that war. When the section providing for the payment of horses, cars, &c., was introduced into the public service and destroyed, Mr. Mayant, from South Carolina, moved to amend the bill so as to embrace slaves. The motion was opposed by Mr. Yancy and Mr. Robertson, and was negatived by a large majority. (See National Intelligencer, December 28, 1816.) This was a motion so to amend this bill as to pay for slaves if killed in the public service, when they had been impressed. I have heard northern members express the opinion, pending this bill, that we ought to pay for slaves, if lost, when they were impressed into the service. Sir, such was not the case thirty-five years since. Our predecessors then turned the proposition. Where now is the feeling, the spirit, which animated them? We have no record of the speeches, but every member will see that the case proposed was the strongest case that could be imagined. It was where a slave was taken against the will of the master, and pressed into the service, and killed by the enemy. Yet they rejected the proposition by a large majority. The claim before us is of incomparably less force. Here the master hired the slave, at a high price, to go with the troops as a guide, and of course took upon himself all risks.

The next case was that of D'Aultrie. He had claims against the United States for wood and other necessities furnished the army, and for the loss of time and the expense of carrying a slave who was wounded in the service of Government at New Orleans. This case is more interesting from the fact, that there was at that time an attempt, as on the present occasion, to break down that well-known principle in our Constitution, that "slaves are persons and not property."

The Committee on Claims at that time (1809) was composed of four northern and three southern men. At its head was an honorable southern man, who served his country longer in this body than any other that ever

sat in this Hall. For more than a quarter of a century he was a distinguished member of this House. There are few, very few, now present, that had the pleasure of serving with him; but his contemporaries can attest to his great abilities and deserved influence. That committee reported in favor of allowing compensation for the articles furnished to the army, but said, expressly, that "slaves not being property, they could not allow the master any compensation for his loss." This was the unanimous report; Mr. Williams of N. Carolina, Mr. McCoy of Virginia, and Mr. Owen of Alabama, uniting in the report. Mr. Williams had been contemporaneous with Madison and Jefferson, and he did not hesitate to avow the doctrine of the Constitution, and to maintain them. Here is the record of his opinion and the views of his associates. When the bill came up in Committee of the Whole, certain southern men suddenly became excited, worked themselves into a passion, threatened a dissolution of the Union, and all that sort of thing. They made a strenuous effort to reverse the decision of the Committee on Claims; but after some two weeks' discussion, gave it up, laid the subject on the table, and there the matter ended.

The discussion was thirty-nine years subsequent to the adoption of the Constitution, and more than fifty from the Declaration of Independence. The principle that slaves were persons, and not property, was reaffirmed, upon full discussion, without the light which we possess on the subject. The Madison Papers were not then published. The views of Gerry and Sherman and Madison, in the Convention, and the action of that body in relation to this matter, was unknown to them. Should we now reverse that decision, and overturn the practice, we shall sin against greater light than they possessed.

The next and only remaining instance in which the question of appropriating the treasure of the nation to pay for slaves was in 1843. "A bill for the relief of the people of West Florida," intended to provide for the payment of slaves taken by the army of General Jackson from the inhabitants of that Territory, in 1814, came up for discussion. The slaves had been taken against the consent of their owners by the military power of the nation. I think there would be ninety slaves taken from different individuals. The proposition was distinct in its character. The object of the bill was to pay for human flesh. I myself opened the debate upon it; and stated, as the principal grounds of my opposition to it, that slaves were not regarded as property under the Federal Constitution. My venerable and lamented friend, now no more, (John Quincy Adams), sustained my position. Several southern gentlemen spoke in favor of the bill. The Journal is now before me, and shows the bill to have been rejected by a vote of one hundred and thirteen to thirty-six. This was done by a Whig Congress. Not one of that party from the free States voted for the bill.

I have now given a history of our legislation on the subject. There was a bill passed this body, "sub silentio," on one of those days when there is, by the rules of the House, no discussion, by which payment was made for a slave. My friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. Dickey) has stated the facts in regard to it. I knew that such a bill was pending, and so did Mr. Adams; and we had mutually agreed to oppose its passage; but it slipped through unnoticed, and, therefore, constitutes no precedent.

In 1843 a bill passed this body to pay over money obtained by the Government from Great Britain, and held in trust by us, to be paid to the owners of slaves lost on board the Comet and Eneconium. This bill also passed the Senate, and became a law. At the last session we passed two bills to pay over money held in trust for the same purpose. These cases were not to take the treasure of the people of the free States to pay for slaves, but to pay over money that did not belong to us, but which we held for the use of those who claimed it. But from the dawn of the Revolution to this day, being more than seventy years, this House has expressed but one opinion on this subject. They have at all times refused to tax the people of the North to pay for the slaves of the South. We have never regarded them as property. But an attempt is now making to change the essential elements of our Government. Statesmen, now, in the high councils of the nation, deny that "all men are created equal;" that "they are endowed by their Creator with the unalienable right to their lives and their liberties;" or, that "Governments are instituted among men to secure the enjoyment of those rights." It is now urged, that this Government was instituted for the purpose of robbing men of those rights; of distributing a portion of our race of their humanity, and reducing them to the state of brutes, and making them the property of others. Will northern members assist to commit this outrage upon the honor of the nation and constitutional rights of the northern States? Is there a member from the free States who will vote to tax his constituents to pay for the blood, and bones, and muscles, of southern slaves? If so, let them place their names on record in favor of this bill, and let that record descend to coming generations, as a lasting memento of the principles which guide them.

I have now referred to the history of our legislation on the subject. The action of our committees was well commented upon by my friend from New Hampshire, (Mr. Wilson.) I wish, however, to add a few words on this point. I am not aware that any committee of this House ever reported in favor of paying for slaves, until the first session of the 27th Congress—being more than sixty-five years from the formation of this Government.

In the 27th Congress, the claim of James Watson for slaves was committed to the Committee on Claims, of which I was myself chairman. The friends of the claim, by some means, learned that the committee had always reported against the payment for slaves. They therefore obtained the transfer of that case to the Committee on Indian Affairs, who reported a bill to pay for the slave

claimed by Watson. That report, made seven years since, was the first in favor of paying for slaves as property, so far as my knowledge extends, ever made to this body. During the same session, a report from the Committee on Territories was made of the "bill for the relief of the people of West Florida," to which I have already alluded, and which was rejected by the House.

At this period, I had been placed at the head of the Committee on Claims, by the then Speaker of this House, (Hon. John White, of Kentucky,) of whom, though a slaveholder, I can never speak except with profound respect. There were at that time many claims for slaves before that committee. In this Hall, before the House, I was interrogated by a slaveholder (Mr. Wise, of Virginia) on this subject. I was asked distinctly whether our committee would report in favor of paying for slaves as property, or whether I would follow the established practice on that subject. He replied, that my answer was evasive, but that the established practice was not to pay for slaves. It so happened, that on the 21st of March, 1842, I introduced certain resolutions declaring the rights of the people of the free States to be exempt from the support of the slave trade. For this I was driven from my seat. Another member was added to the Committee on Claims; and then, sir, during my absence, just eight days after I left the committee, this case was urged upon the members, who were most of them inexperienced in their duties, and unacquainted with the precedents. I left this Hall on the 23d March, and on the 1st day of April following a bill was reported by a slaveholding member of that committee, to pay for this man Lewis. This was the first case of the kind that ever received a favorable report from that particular committee; and that report was obtained in the manner just stated. It was in the sixty-seventh year of American independence, and the fifty-third of our Constitution. This is the history of this subject, and of this bill. It was reported seven years since by a Whig committee. We are yet to see whether this House can be induced to pass it.

Sir, we have the power to overturn the practice of this body from its first formation; we may overthrow its established and time-honored principles; we may defeat the objects of those who framed the Constitution; we may subvert the established elements of that sacred compact which we are sworn to support; we may attempt to change the law of our existence—to deface the work of God, and declare his image to be property; we may do all this at the bidding of the slave power; we may humble ourselves in the presence of those who hold the rod of terror over us; but there is a superior Power that will hold us to a strict account of our stewardship. Sir, the eyes of the people are upon us; they are watching our actions. The concentrated rays of intelligence now brought to bear upon all our doings, render it impossible for us to deceive them. No evasion, no subterfuge will screen those who would render northern freemen subsidiary to the support of southern slavery.

Sir, when I reflect that I am now constrained to sit in this Hall to legislate upon the price of human flesh as property, I feel humbled. Before the nation, before Heaven, I protest against this degradation. By what right shall I arrive at the value of this man? He is said to be very intelligent and learned, reading and writing four languages. In this respect he has, probably, few equals in this Hall. I mean no offense by this comparison, either to gentlemen now present, or to the negro who is absent. I regard the moral qualities of a man as the proper criterion by which to graduate my respect. In this light I know not whether the comparison be unjust to him or to those who estimate his value at precisely a thousand dollars. I would be as willing to enter into an inquiry as to the value of the body of the honorable member reporting this bill, as I am to estimate the value of a man who, as a linguist, probably has not a dozen equals in this body. If we are to judge of him by the value of the commodity, if placed in this body, he might have reflected honor upon our country and our race. The splendor of his genius might have soared far above the groveling intellects now engaged in figuring up his value in dollars and cents. His name might have been placed in future history beside that of Wirt, of Henry, of Burke, and of Sheridan; or perhaps his philanthropy might have placed him on the roll of fame with Adams and Wilberforce. And yet we are now sitting here to inquire as to the value of this immortal mind, to estimate its price in "glittering dross." My soul shrinks from the impious sacrifice with loathing and disgust. But this ethereal, immortal intellect, was bound in the chains of bondage, shut out from that sphere of usefulness and of action in which God designed to move; and we are now asked to compensate this claimant for committing this wrong to mankind, this crime against God. I am anxious to see how northern members estimate their fellow-men. What price do they put upon their constituents? Let their votes give the answer!

On a former occasion, I cited the opinion of an eminent jurist (Judge McLean) on this subject.

In the case of Groves vs. Slaughter and others, (15 Peters Reports, 449,) this question came distinctly before the Supreme Court of the United States. The constitution of Mississippi had prohibited the introduction of slaves into that State after a certain day. Slaves were taken there and sold on a credit after the time allowed by the constitution of that State. Suit was commenced on the note given in consideration of the slaves. The defense set up was, that the contract was illegal and void under the constitution of that State, which prohibited the sale therein of slaves from without the State. The reply to this was, that slaves were property, and therefore the State of Mississippi had no power to prohibit their introduction into the State, as the power to regulate commerce between the States belonged only to

Congress. In deciding the law, Judge McLean said:

"By the laws of certain States, slaves are treated as property; and the constitution of Mississippi prohibits their being brought into that State by citizens of other States for sale as merchandise. Merchandise is a comprehensive term, and may include every article of traffic, whether foreign or domestic, which is properly embraced by a commercial regulation. But if slaves are considered in some of the States as merchandise, that cannot prevent them of the leading and controlling quality of persons, by which they are designated by the Constitution. The character of property is given them by the local law. This law is respected, and all rights under it are protected by the Federal authorities; but the Constitution acts upon slaves as persons and not as property."

But one member of that court dissented from these views. It may therefore be regarded as an authority, so far as the Judiciary are concerned.

If the doctrine contended for by the friends of this bill be correct; if slaves be property, slave markets may be opened in Boston, and Massachusetts will have no power to prohibit there the revolting scenes which are witnessed in this city. If the doctrine contended for by southern men be correct, no State can exclude slave markets from its territory, or consecrate its soil to freedom. It will become southern gentlemen to examine this bill before they base themselves upon the principle that slaves are property. Let that be established, and Congress will have power to prohibit the internal slave trade at its pleasure.

But, sir, as I am for the moment engaged in a legal examination of the case, I desire to follow it a little further. This man was guilty of treason against the United States, or he was an enemy to our Government. I think it doubtful whether slaves can commit treason, as they owe no allegiance to our Government. But if he was not a traitor, he was surely an enemy to the country. Now, sir, whether traitor or enemy, and the master, knowing the fact, "had harbored him," "adhered to him," or "given him aid and comfort," would not the master have been guilty of the crime of treason against our laws? Of this, I think there is no doubt. And yet we are called upon to pay him a thousand dollars for taking away a man thus dangerous to himself, who, if he had remained with him, would probably subject him to the gallows. Let gentlemen reflect and vote as men, as intelligent statesmen.

Military officers are the agents of Government, to do all things pertaining to their office, and which come within the line of their duties. General Jessup was an agent to send out of Florida all enemies of the country; he was not our agent to send the friends of Government west of the Mississippi. If he has done so, the act is his, not ours. It was unauthorized, and he alone is liable. Now I understand the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Burt) to urge that he was an enemy, and dangerous to the country. I admit the fact, and say that he should be treated as an enemy. But if he were not an enemy, then there is no claim on the Government.

But the committee are not content with urging that he was an enemy to the country, and dangerous; they suddenly change the argument, and say that he was taken for public use. An enemy to the nation is taken for public use. Well, sir, the argument is ingenious. It never found a place in the mind of Groves or Puffendorf, or of any writer upon the law of nations, or the rights of Government. But the point was adopted by the arguments of the gentleman from South Carolina, and perhaps I ought to notice it. For what use was he taken? To what use was he applied? The gentleman admits the right to shoot or to hang him. Would not that have been as much "taking for public use" as it was to banish him? The use of sending him out of the country was the preservation of the lives and property of the people. That would have been equally attained by shooting or hanging the negro. But the reply to this, that he was property. Well, I repeat, suppose he had been a rabid dog or a vicious mule, killing people and destroying their property, and General Jessup had shot or chased him out of the country to prevent him from killing his master or others; would the Government have been liable? I will not argue the point further.

Again, it is said, that by the act of hiring we admitted the slave to be property, and that the Government is now estopped from denying that fact. We are bound to treat all arguments on this floor with respect. But to suppose that this obscure lieutenant, who, perhaps, never read a commentary on the Constitution, and who, I dare say, never dreamed that he was affecting, or doing anything to affect, our rights or our duties; I say, to suppose that his acts would stop Congress from maintaining the Constitution, or that such acts would have any weight whatever with this body, is a proposition which I will not detain the House to examine. He was our agent for the purposes of doing his military duty; but we never authorized him to legislate for us, or to give construction to our constitutional rights. Why, sir, I may hire out my son, or apprentice, or my hired servant; but would that be an admission that they were my property? Or suppose I agree that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Burt) shall attend the Speaker to a given place; does that imply that I hold him as property? No, sir; the only fact implied is, that I have a right to receive the wages when the labor or duty is performed, according to my contract. In this case, the claimant agreed that Lewis should accompany the troops, and the officer agreed to pay the master twenty-five dollars per month. The claimant may have made the same arrangement in regard to any freeman as he did in regard to Lewis; and when the labor was performed, he would have the same right to the money. But in such case, would the Government be obliga-

ted to pay him for the body of such freeman. No doubt the same obligations would rest upon the hirer that now rests on the Government, and no more.

But the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Burt) says, that the act of 1815, levying direct taxes, recognizes slaves as property. That law provides, "that such tax shall constitute a lien upon the real estate and upon all slaves of individuals upon whom said taxes shall be assessed." My presumption is, that this bill was drawn by some southern man who did not reflect that slaves were less property under the Federal Constitution than they were under the laws of the slave States. The gentleman does not pretend that at the passage of that law, the question whether slaves were persons or property, was raised or discussed or thought of. I need not say, that a bill passed, sub silentio, constitutes no precedent. In our courts of justice, the judge takes no notice of questions not made by the parties, nor do the proceedings of a court form any authority on points not raised nor discussed by counsel, nor examined by the court.

The case of Depeyster, to which I referred, was a stronger case than that of the law of 1815. My friend from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Dickey,) as well as myself, stated that that case passed when no one knew it. I knew that my lamented friend (Mr. Adams) and myself, both intended to oppose its passage, and we were both watching it; but it got through when we were unconscious of it. Does any man—I will not say lawyer—suppose that its passage constitutes any precedent showing that slaves are property? Yet this law of 1815, so far as we know, received no more attention, (or at least that part of it relating to slaves,) than did the act for the relief of Depeyster. It can, therefore, constitute no precedent.

The force of a precedent consists in the respect which we pay to the judgment of a former Congress. It is therefore necessary, to give a precedent any force whatever, that the judgment of the tribunal should have been exercised upon the question; and it is immaterial whether it be a judicial or legislative precedent. Thus, in each case that I have cited as precedents either in this House or in committees, you noticed the questions now under consideration were discussed, and deliberation had, and a judgment given upon the point before. Now, sir, let me say, with all due respect to southern gentlemen, that I challenge them to produce an instance in which this House, or the Supreme Court of the United States, or any respectable court of any free State, has decided slaves to be property under the Federal Constitution, in any case where that question has been raised, discussed, or examined. I desire to see gentlemen come to a definite issue on this subject. I wish to meet them fairly and distinctly. They must admit that the framers of the Constitution intended to exclude from that instrument the idea that there could be property in man. To that point I intend to hold them. And I call upon them to meet the record of Mr. Madison, to which I have referred. Let them deny that record, or carry out the intentions of the framers of that instrument.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Burt) says he "should like to know what was contemplated by that clause in the Constitution which stipulates for the surrender of fugitive slaves, unless it be that their owners hold property in them?" I answer, that clause means just what it says. It gives to the holder of slaves the right to pursue and recapture them in a free State, precisely as it gives me the right to pursue and recapture my apprentice or my son in any State to which he may escape. It no more admits the slave to be property than it admits the apprentice or the minor to be property. I am tired of hearing this clause of the Constitution quoted to prove almost every doctrine advanced by southern men. Its provisions are of the most plain and obvious character. It merely provides for the recapture and return of slaves, and nothing more.

But my hour is nearly expired. I and my constituents hold slavery to be a crime of the deepest dye. The robbing a man of his money or property, or the seizing of his ship upon the high seas, we regard as heinous offenses, which should exclude the perpetrator from associations for the time being. But we look upon those crimes as of small importance when compared with that of robbing a man of his labor, his liberty, his social, his intellectual enjoyments; to disrobe him of his humanity, to degrade and brutalize him. On this account we protest solemnly against being involved in the wickedness and in the crimes of that institution. To-day we are asked to pay our money for the liberty of our fellow-man. We hold that he was endowed with that liberty by his Creator; that it is impious, and in the highest degree criminal, for one man, or for a government, to rob any portion of our race of their God-given rights. As the representative of a Christian and a moral constituency, I deny the right of Congress to involve them or me in the support of such crimes. By our compact of Union, no such power is delegated to Congress. By the passage of this bill, we shall become slave dealers ourselves—traders in humanity. The people of one State shrink from the foul contagion. With Mr. Gerry, we hold that "we have nothing to do with slavery in the States; but we will be careful not to give in any sanction;" with Mr. Madison, we hold that "it would be wrong to admit that there can be property in man;" and with the signers of the Declaration of American Independence, we hold that it is a "self-evident truth that all men are created equal." We believe our rights to enjoy these doctrines unmolested by this Government are as clear and indisputable as are the rights of the slave States to deny them in theory and in practice. We claim no superiority of privileges under the compact. We admit them, under the Constitution, to enjoy their slavery unmolested by Congress or by the free States. Its blessings and its curses, its honors and its disgrace, are theirs. We neither claim the one, nor will we share in the other. We will have no participation in its guilt. "It is the object of our perfect hate." Southern

gentlemen may continue to misrepresent us, by saying that we seek to interfere with that institution in the States; but, thank God, we have at last obtained access to the public ear. The people of the free States now understand that all our efforts, politically, are based upon the constitutional right of being exempt from its support. For years I have made it a practice, in almost every speech I have made in this Hall, to guard against misrepresentation, by avowing my doctrines. I am aware of the efforts now making by northern presses, letter-writers from this city, and editors who pander to the slave power, to misrepresent my views, and assail my motives. Sir, let me say to those men before Heaven: If they will come up to the work, unto their influence, and separate this Government from the support of slavery and the slave trade, and leave that institution where the Constitution placed it—with the States in practical possession—with gratitude to God, and with love and good will to all my fellow-men, I will retire from these halls to the obscurity of private life.

JACK BUNSBY ON CALIFORNIA—GOLD vs. POTATOES.—The following hit is from the New York Sunday News:

Being asked what he thought of the gold panic, Bunsby crossed his boots, took a whiff, and said, "If so be as how gold can be got in California for digging, why, good! the only question would be, to dig or not to dig. And so, but then, do ye see, a man must do something else besides digging. He must eat, drink, sleep, and be clothed withal—and if all the people turn gold diggers, who shall perform all the other kind of work? Now, if so be, a man should dig gold, and fill his pockets, why, so. And, if so be, no other man should dig praties, and fill a tin kettle, and put it over a fire, in union with some wild kids and a few yarks, and the man who had been digging the gold should come and say, give me some of that 'ere mess, why, so, also. Now, what would the pratie-digger say? How much gold have ye dug? Oh, says the gold digger, I have had great luck to-day, but I am very hungry. Good, says the pratie digger; give me two-thirds of your gold, and you shall dine with me.—Why, you inhospitable fellow, do you want to rob? No, says the pratie-digger, but go and eat your gold. I'll eat my dinner alone, and save what is left until to-morrow, and then I can go and dig gold, and you can dig praties for yourself. Now, says Bunsby, the pratie-digger would be the best off, for the other could not wait until the morrow for a dinner, and it's therefore my opinion that digging praties may be, under some circumstances, more profitable than digging gold, and my name's Jack Bunsby."

FREE COLORED SCHOOLS IN LOUISIANA.—The House of Representatives on Saturday last passed a bill appropriating annually the sum of one thousand dollars for the support of schools for free children of color. Up to this time the free people of color have contributed their full share of taxes for the maintenance of the public schools, without in the slightest degree participating in their benefits. This is a great injustice—compatible neither with Democracy nor Republicanism, as Mr. Pillsbury observed. It is not an inconsiderable portion of the taxation that is borne by the free people of color—the public schools are closed to them, although their property is burdened for the support of that institution. This is not equitable on the part of the stronger toward the weaker class. The bill is now before the Senate, having passed the House of Representatives; and it is to be hoped that the Senate will deem it, as the House has done, a mere act of justice, to say nothing of the general good to be derived from spreading the blessings of education among a class of people who have always been true to the State and faithful to their public duties whenever called upon to discharge them.—N. O. Courier.

From the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

We gave in the last Standard a report, as far as it had then transpired, of the case of Joseph Belt, who was feloniously seized in our public streets, on Wednesday the 21st December, by the hired myrmidons of JOHN LEE, of Frederick county, Maryland, and by him, in person, claimed as a fugitive from service, the claim being first set up in answer to a writ of habeas corpus, issued by Judge Edmonds, for the purpose of bringing up Joseph and his kidnappers, who had been traced to an obscure tavern on Long Island.

We give, to-day, the result of the various hearings, already known to many of our readers—the promissory discharge of Belt, with the grounds on which it was made, and his departure to a place of safety.

In another column will be found the points raised by Mr. Jay, counsel for the fugitive, the answer of Mr. Whiting, counsel for Lee, and the grounds of the discharge. In our next we may be able to give the written opinion of Judge Edmonds, as well as the remarks of Mr. Child, who was associated with Mr. Jay. Considered in many of its aspects, this case is one of the most important ever decided in a Free State, and must give another staggering blow to the slave power in this country. From the best information we can gather, Lee is one of an association of Maryland slaveholders, who are banded together for the purposes of mutual protection in the matter of their abominable chattels, and that he was acting in this case by their advice and cooperation. The desperation with which he pushed his case, is, perhaps, to be accounted for by this fact, and to his frequent recurrence to the large number of wealthy slaveholders who would help

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE, SALEM, O.

ed by the several footings of the committee, and Seabury Ford has 147,798 votes, and John B. Weller 147,120 votes, being a majority for Ford of 678 votes. I say further, Mr. Speaker, that I deducted the vote of Lorain county which gave Ford 610 majority, and I then found that Ford had still 68 majority. So that which ever course was pursued, whichever rule was adopted, being either legal or technical, going according to the facts in either case, Seabury Ford was entitled to be declared elected Governor. It was therefore necessary to produce a different result, to adopt a liberal course in part, and a technical course in part. Mr. Backus concluded at 1 o'clock, and

The Senate immediately took a recess.

COMMUNICATED.

"They have eyes but they see not."

DEAR EDITORS:

The truth of the above declaration is evidenced by every day's observation. Not less true is it of the modern church, than of the Jews of old, to whom it was originally addressed. The clearness of moral vision evidenced by the ease with which they will detect lesser deviations from the good and the right way, at the same time that they are guilty of the more gross and flagrant violations of right, would seem the rather to render them obnoxious to the charge of refusing to come to the light lest their deeds should be reprov'd. Why is it that, with respect to certain sins, we seem to be in possession of intuitive perception of their essential sinfulness, while, in regard to others, though of a more heinous character, it seems nearly impossible for very many to see that very much essentially wrong enters into their composition?—indeed, so far from it, they think they can detect many features quite redeeming in their character, and so far forth modifying the thing as, perhaps, in the aggregate, to make it "a merciful visitation."

These reflections were, in part, suggested to my mind by a few recent occurrences in this place: On New-Years evening we had a Temperance meeting—in all respects interesting and well attended. It was addressed by the Baptist and one of the Methodist ministers who minister in this place. It was the object of the first to enlighten Christians in the matter of their duty with respect to the use of intoxicating drinks. He adduced many and good arguments to prove that they should "touch not," &c., "of the unclean thing." Among other reasons presented was the fact that it essentially impairs our influence in our efforts to spread the gospel among the heathen. That we had gone to them "with the gospel in one hand and the bowl in the other," and having thus received at our hands that which was highly conducive to their misery, it was difficult for them to accord to us honesty of purpose in our professed wish to be of spiritual service to them. Very well, thought I—that is true—all ecceit—all feel its force. Now suppose that the missionary, instead of the bowl, have in his hand the price of blood! the market value of some home-made heathen, which is the worth of his services for seven years—the average life of the southern slave—born of christian ordination, justified, and established *adultery*—(for marriage among slaves is not known)—educated in the school taught by the beasts of the field—fornidden to read the name of the God that made her or him, and learning that name only as the author of his misfortunes, the decrier of his despair—the merciful originator of whips, paddles, thumb-screws, doggings, shootings, &c., &c., as a sort of time-purgatory to induce obedience to their masters, *alms* obedience to God; this metamorphosed into what is called a christian, with this additional item, to wit, her child was torn from her bosom and battered to the venter for wine which has been duly administered by the hand of Rev. Hyprocisy, by whose mouth the auctioneer has been duly instructed to urge the enhanced value of the ARTICLE in the sum of \$100 to \$200, in consideration of this christianizing process! Suppose, I say, that instead of the bowl in his hand, the missionary goes out to the heathen on the strength of funds raised in this manner. What think you will be the judgment of the heathen world as to the advantages accruing to them by embracing your religion? Will they not have abundant occasion to fear you as emissaries of Satan. Aye, they already do, and God grant it may be more so till you repent.

These are the circumstances under which very many of the American missionaries are laboring to day. The Lord Jesus, in the person of his "little ones," is sold in the market, (to old Zach—recently constituted a life-member of a missionary society, and now President elect of this Republic—ha! ha!) and the funds (raised by slaughtering innocent Mexican women at the rate of \$300 per month,) are deposited in the Treasury of the A. B. C. F. M. as the basis of Missionary operations. Neighbors of Orangeville, shall we hold a meeting to expose this iniquity? Rev. Lecturers, will you address us? What is the response? Aye—I need not ask the question—I know the response.

But there was another incident that naturally induced reflections in the minds of some. The Methodist lecturer took occasion to read from the Discipline of the M. E. Church the new rule of that church in respect to the use of intoxicating drinks. It forbids its use or the traffic in it on the part of members of the church, except in cases of extreme necessity, and an infringement of the rule is visited

with due reproof, and if there be not evidence of humiliation and reform, "the offender shall be cut off."

But suppose he is guilty of the most daring theft,—not that he has stolen his neighbor's horse,—not that he has stolen of that neighbor a few hundred dollars,—no, but he has stolen the neighbor himself! He has seized him, because he has the power to do it—he drives him to unrequited toil—assumes the right to dispose of him, as the interests of his coffers may suggest, and yet he may be a member of the M. E. Church in good and regular standing! Nay more—in those States, the laws of which forbid emancipation, and the liberated slave to enjoy his freedom, this monster of sin is eligible to any office in the M. E. Church!

Is it not true—may it not be assumed, that those who have light enough to see the sin of using liquor, and exclude it the church, see that slaveholding should in like manner be dealt with? I so write it. Ye knew your duty, but ye did it not.

As ever yours,
E. F. CURTIS.
ORANGEVILLE, Jan. 6th, 1849.

FRIENDS EDITORS:

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, of the Western Peace Society, held in Marlboro' Nov. 12th, 1848, the following resolutions were adopted.

Resolved, That we highly appreciate the labors of Henry C. Wright, in the cause of Peace in Ohio, and approve the fearless and uncompromising course he has pursued.

Resolved, That we cordially invite him to return to the West, at his earliest convenience.

Resolved, That the Corresponding Secretary be instructed to furnish Henry C. Wright, with a copy of the foregoing resolutions; and send copies to the "Bugle," and to the "Non-Resistant, and Practical Christian," for publication.

MATILDA J. WALTON, Cor. Sec.
MARIUS R. ROBINSON, Pres.

NANCY STEADMAN, Sec.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

SALEM, JANUARY 19, 1849.

"I LOVE AGITATION WHEN THERE IS CAUSE FOR IT.—THE ALARM BELL WHICH STARTLES THE INHABITANTS OF A CITY, SAVES THEM FROM BEING BURNED IN THEIR BEDS." Edmund Burke.

Persons having business connected with the paper, will please call on James Barnaby, corner of Main and Chesnut sts.

Meetings at Carmel and Middleton.

James Barnaby and Isaac Treecott will address Anti-Slavery meetings, at Middleton Saturday evening, 27th January. At Carmel meeting house, Sunday the 28th, 2 o'clock and Evening.

State Legislature.

Disunionists have certainly cause to be thankful that they never aided to create, nor consented to the existence of such an unprincipled, reckless body as the Ohio Legislature. And could its members be boxed up—the good, bad, and indifferent, for each of these classes will be found among them—and carried around the country menagerie fashion, and exhibited in every district in the State, it would do the people more good than ten thousand homilies on the demoralizing effects of party politics.

If the Penitentiary at Columbus has within its walls as great a set of scoundrels as are congregated within the walls of the Capitol, penitentiary morals have certainly retrograded. It is true, the first wear the regiments of the prison, while the others are clothed in the garb of gentility; but we do not hesitate to say that in respectability, black-guardism, and profanity, the *Honorable* defy comparison with the *Convicts*.

Men sometimes affect, or perchance feel, a holy horror of no-governmentism, as they call obedience to the law of God without the intervention of human authority to enforce it, but if they would see that kind of no-governmentism which alike defies the laws of God and man, let them go to the Capitol at Columbus, and witness the deeds of Ohio's Legislators.

As will be seen from the reports in another place, when the announcement of the returns of the Gubernatorial canvass was about to be made, a most disgraceful scene ensued. One Senator highly excited and enraged, addressing the Speaker of the Senate, said, "God damn your perjured soul." A member of the other House, when their Speaker demanded order, flourished his cane over the clerk's desk and yelled, "Order, hell! Order, hell! Order, hell!!!"

It is about time that both Houses adjourned sine die.

The idea of a *Universal Brotherhood* is a beautiful one—but it can exist only in the beautiful theory of the Ideal. Let a man stay here one week and mingle in the excitement of the political circles, and the idea of a Brotherhood, will leave him, as the dew leaves the flowers at the appearance of the unclouded morning sun.

Such is the testimony of the Columbus correspondent of the "True Democrat," as to the effect which politics has upon the morals. Jesus preached the doctrine of *UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD*—it is that which gives life and vitality to Christianity—it is that by which man is to be made worthy of his Creator, and without which the world would be

even more degraded and brutish than it is. If politics obliterate from the human heart the idea of *Universal Brotherhood*; then the mission of Politics and the mission of Jesus are opposed to each other. Let those of our readers who have been affected by political excitement and led onward in the path that it opened, look again at the declaration we have quoted, and pause and ask themselves "Where are we? Whither doth this lead?"

PRESENTS FROM FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS, or from the sovereigns of those governments, have been made of late years to many citizens of the United States. In some cases, however, the recipients have overlooked the fact that any American who receives such presents, without the consent of Congress, "shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them." Those who have received these presents without permission of Congress, are therefore aliens, and their real estate, if they hold any where citizenship is required, may be claimed by the State government.

We have been reminded of these facts, by the arrival at Boston of a magnificent gold brooch, studded with diamonds, a present from the Sultan of Turkey to Mr. Morse, in honor of the invention of the telegraph. It was entered at the Custom House in that city on Wednesday, and some idea of its value may be inferred from the fact that the duties upon it amount to \$130. Mr. Morse must receive the permission of Congress before he can accept this present, otherwise he loses all his rights and privileges as a citizen of the United States, and when thus denationalized, being a citizen of no country, we presume his great telegraphic invention would revert to the people. The latter might be a public benefit, but it is too great a sacrifice for Mr. Morse to make for the sake of a Sultan's brooch.—*New York Sun*.

One of the most contemptible features in the American government, is the petty jealousy it shows of its citizens, the fear lest a present from a foreign government should shake, perhaps destroy their allegiance to this. The Constitutional clause referred to above, smacks strongly of the plantation rule of the Hon Mr. Flogenhard of South Carolina, or Judge Moveemquick of Alabama.

"Tom!"
"Yes, Massa!"
"If Mr. Easyman gives you any more tobacco or anything else, you musn't keep it without first asking me."

"Yes, Massa! Thank you Massa!"

The Sultan of Turkey is somewhat interested in science, has examined a model of the electric telegraph, and understands its workings. As a tribute to the inventive genius of the man who gave it to the world, he sent him a jeweled gift. "Mr. Morse," says the U. S. government, "you have no right to accept that present without my permission. Do it, and I'll proclaim you an alien; I'll divest you of citizenship."

Such is the position this *free* government sustains toward its subjects—a position degrading to every citizen who aspires to the possession of a soul. It would teach them, we think, to value but lightly the citizenship that government so easily and without provocation destroys; and would suggest a thought of the possibility that two could play at the same game; and that if the government chose to disfranchise them because some foreigner with a crown on his head made them a present, they could disfranchise themselves when government required of them, that which their sense of justice and honor forbids.

DISOLUTION OF THE UNION.—Some of the hunkers of the North express great fear that our southern brethren will withdraw from the Union if the provision of the Ordinance of 1787, or the Wilmot Proviso be persisted in by the North—they insist that there is no doubt about it and think it "dreadful" to continue to agitate this question longer. How absurd the opinion that the South will withdraw from the Union. Why the very fact that she is overrun with slaves, would prevent such a movement. She dare not separate from the North lest her own slaves should rise up and butcher her inhabitants. The North in that case would not be compelled to protect them. If these hunkers would bear in mind that there are at least five blacks to one white person in the southern states, they would not utter such foolish opinions in regard to the action of slave holders, who would make our free territories slave territories.—*Buff. Rep.*

What is the reason that people will not comprehend the truths upon which the anti-slavery reform is built. Not only do Disunionists show that so long as the North and South hold governmental relations, the former is bound to protect the latter in its slaveholding acts, but politicians who cling to the Union as the very ark of salvation, are now and then uttering truths, perhaps unconsciously, that Disunionists are vilified for declaring; and yet the people do not comprehend their bearing. Take, for instance, the paragraph quoted above, which admits that if the slaves of the South should go forth to battle for their rights, the North would be compelled to protect each and every southern State against these swartthy seekers of freedom—that such is the pledge by which the people here stand bound. Such an admission is a seal of infamy upon the nation's reputation; and if the editor of the "Buffalo Reporter" should ever presume to speak of this nation as high-minded, freedom-loving, just and generous, we hope that some one will remind him that he has himself asserted the contrary, inasmuch as he contends that she has pledged herself to crush humanity when she wears a colored robe, and to quench the last spark of liberty which burns in the bosoms of American bondmen.

What would be thought of the Republic

of France should it enter into a compact with Nicholas of Russia, engaging, should Poland ever again attempt to re-assert her liberty, to lend her aid to crush the rebellion? Should she thus act, almost the entire civilized world would declare, "Among all the nations of the earth let her be accursed!"

The compact which the North has entered into with the South is worse than the compact we have described; and whether or not the present generation in America awakes to a knowledge of the infamy of such a deed, their posterity will regard it as an act more traitorous to humanity, than was that of Benedict Arnold to his country.

Supreme Court in Bank—December Term, 1848.

[Reported for the Ohio State Journal, by H. Griswold, Esq.]

TUESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1849.

No. 41. Hugh C. Stewart, et al. v. William R. Southard. *Error*. Fayette, Bircard, C. J. Held, 1. That a declaration averring that the plaintiff is a resident of a certain school district, having children which he is desirous to have taught in said school, and that the defendants, directors of the school district, contriving to deprive him of the benefit of having his children therein educated, unlawfully admitted colored children into the school, whereby the plaintiff has been deprived of the benefit and advantage of having his children taught in said school, is bad on demurrer. 2. That an officer acting within the scope of his duty, is only responsible for an injury resulting from a corrupt motive.—Judgment reversed.

If we understand the legal form of the above report, the following statement of the case would be a correct one.

The defendants were directors of a public school, and desirous of knowing what their duties were, consulted that clause of the Constitution of Ohio which refers to education, and the act of Congress granting public lands for the purpose of aiding in the establishment of schools, and finding that no preference was to be given to one class above another, and that no distinction was to be made, threw open to all within the district, the doors of the school with which they were connected.

This grievously wounded the feelings of the plaintiff, who was unfortunately strongly tainted with colorphobia, and more in anger than in sorrow he refused to let his children attend school where colored children were admitted. We think we can fully appreciate his disappointment and rightly estimate the intensity of his sufferings. He had congratulated himself on having his children taught at the expense of the colored people of Ohio, and that without being contaminated by intercourse with them, for he did not suppose—although their property was taxed for school purposes—that any school directors in his neighborhood would admit black children within the hallowed precincts of a log school house. But his anticipations were not realized. The tables were turned, and sad to relate, colored children were educated at his expense, and that, in a house which he and his were debared from entering, for it is not to be supposed he would demean himself by stooping to such practical amalgamation as to send his children to a school where colored children were admitted.

The longer he brooded over his wrongs, the greater appeared the injustice done him, until a lawsuit was resorted to with the hope it might prove a panacea. He triumphed; the decision was in his favor; he was declared to be in the right and the directors in the wrong. The directors however, were so unreasonable as not to be satisfied with the award, and by a Writ of Error threw the case into the Supreme court, where the decision of the court below was reviewed by Chief Justice Burchard, who reversed the previous decision, much to the plaintiff's surprise and chagrin.

Thus it seems that although the defendants, by admitting colored children into a school where the plaintiff expected to send his own, deprived him of the advantages of said school, yet such act is no ground for damages, and no reason why the contrary decision of an inferior court should not be reversed; and that the directors, in admitting colored children were only acting within the scope of their official duty, and as the injury they did the plaintiff was without any corrupt motive, they should not therefore be held responsible for his lacerated feelings.

We should be glad to see a fuller report of Judge Burchard's decision, for we infer from the brief report quoted, it involves an opinion upon the constitutionality of the Black school law.

How CAN IT BE RECONCILED?—In the speech of J. R. Giddings on our first page the enormity of slaveholding is thus illustrated:

"The robbing a man of his money or property, or the seizing of his ship upon the high seas, we regard as grievous offences, which should exclude the perpetrator from human associations for the time being. But we look upon those crimes as of small importance when compared with that of robbing a man of his labor, his liberty, his social, his intellectual enjoyments; to disrobe him of his humanity, to degrade and brutalize him."

In the course of the same speech he refers to Hon. John White of Ky., "of whom, though a slaveholder, I can never speak without the most profound respect." Now it strikes us that if slaveholding is so much worse than ordinary robbery and piracy, and if robbery and piracy are so bad that the per-

petrators of them should be excluded "from human association for the time being," the slaveholder should not be treated with the "most profound respect." Either let us condemn all systems of crime and treat all criminals with profound respect, or else condemn all systems and all criminals; or if we make a distinction in the latter, treat those guilty of the lesser crimes, robbery and piracy, with more profound respect than we do those who are guilty of the greater, SLAVEHOLDING.

But while pointing out this inconsistency, as it appears to us, we would not fail to call attention to the valuable historical facts his speech contains, and especially to that portion of it where he gives vent to his indignation at being called upon to appraise the value of a human being. We suspect none of the slaveholders then present were overpowered by the respect he lavished upon them in his comparison between their value and that of the slave they were asked to pay for.

EXTRA SESSION OF CONGRESS.—The President has issued his proclamation to convene an extra session of Congress on the 5th of March; so the short session may in fact be a long one, and the people continue to be cheated by Congressional swindlers until dogs-days. Should the Cholera compel them speedily to adjourn, it would be a merciful visitant at the capitol.

Important from Columbus.

On the 10th inst. the House called the roll thirty times, and thirty-five motions to adjourn were made, and lost. This is the Legislature for which the people are taxed to pay.

Medina Co.

Our friends H. W. Curtis and J. W. Walker expect shortly to visit Medina Co. on a lecturing tour. How long they will stay, or in what portion of it they will labor, will be determined as circumstances may seem to them to render advisable. We trust that the friends there will make their stay as pleasant to the laborers and as profitable to the cause as possible.

Our edition of last week and of this has been printed on paper we were ashamed to use. We would esteem it a great blessing if we could meet with a paper manufacturer who could be depended upon to furnish a good article all the time, and not a mixture of good and bad as has heretofore been our portion.

REMEMBER

That the Fair at Massillon commences on Wednesday the 31st inst. and will continue open the remainder of that week. And don't forget that aid is needed, as we stated in our last.

SOUTHERN CONGRESSIONAL CAUCUS.—Monday last was the day to which this body adjourned. Who knows but the Union is dissolved by this time, and that we are without a National, as we have been in fact without a State government.

CHOLERA.—This disease has entirely disappeared from New York since the extremely cold weather has visited that city, and the cooler atmosphere which now surrounds New Orleans, has caused it greatly to abate there.

THE PRISONER'S FRIEND for January contains an engraving representing Fair Mount waterworks at Philadelphia. Mrs. Livermore contributes an admirable tale, "The Troublesome Neighbors;" the editor furnishes a valuable statistical article, on Female Penitentiaries; J. H. Robinson an anti-slavery poem entitled "The Pictorial Chief;" these, with other articles of interest constitute the contents of the number before us.

Adam Sanders, of Chester Roads will act as agent for the Bugle.

AMERICAN METROPOLITAN MAGAZINE.

This is the title of a new monthly issued from the New York press by Israel Post, 359 Broadway, and edited by Wm. Landon. It is to be American in its character, and its first twelve numbers will contain a serial illustration of the life of Washington. The number before us is embellished with three fine engravings beside numerous wood cut illustrations, resembling in its appearance the New York Union Magazine. Judging from the many excellent articles which the last number contains, and from the strong array of writers whose services the publisher has secured, we should think it would prove a deservedly successful competitor for public favor. The terms are the same as those of other magazines, \$3 per annum for one copy, \$5 for two, \$10 for five.

Louis Napoleon's Inaugural Address.

The following is the address delivered by the President of France at his inauguration. It is a model of brevity worthy the study of American statesmen.

CITIZENS AND REPRESENTATIVES.—The suffrages of the nation, and the oath I have just taken, trace out for me my future conduct. I shall follow it as a man of honor, and I shall regard as enemies of my country all those who shall attempt to change, by illegal means, what all France has so distinctly established. Between you and me, citizens and representatives, there cannot be any real difference of opinion. Our wishes and desires are the same. I wish like you to place society on the true basis; to strengthen de-

ocratic institutions, and to alleviate the miseries of that generous and intelligent people which has just given me such a striking proof of its confidence. The majority I have obtained not only penetrates me with gratitude, but will give to the new government that moral force without which there is no authority. With peace and order our country can again improve, can cure its wounds, and bring back the men that have been misled, and calm down the passions. Animated by a sincere spirit of conciliation, I have railed around me capable and patriotic men, who, despite of the diversity of their political origin, are ready to devote themselves with you to the application of the constitution, the improvement of the laws, and the glory of the Republic.

A Government coming into power owes a debt of thanks to its predecessors, when the deposits of its authority is handed over to it intact; and, in particular, I owe it to General Cavaignac to say, that his conduct has been worthy of the generosity of his character, and that sentiment of duty which is the first quality of a statesman. [Hear, hear.] We have, citizens and representatives, a grand mission to fulfill. To found the Republic is the interest of all—and a just and firm government. I shall be animated by a sincere desire of progress, without being reactionary or Utopian. Let us be the men of our country, not the men of party; and, with the aid of God, we shall at least do good, if we cannot achieve great things."

Virginia Legislature.

The following resolutions were recently introduced into the Va., Legislature, by a select committee, of which Mr. Floyd, Governor elect of that State, was chairman.

1. Resolved, That the institution of Slavery was fully discussed by the Convention which framed the Constitution of the United States, and that the rights of the slaveholders were fully recognized and amply protected by its provisions; that, without the compromises then solemnly entered into, the Union of the States never could have been formed; that any attempt to abridge the rights of the slaveholder, or to prohibit his free emigration, with his slaves, to any portion of any territory of the United States, required by the common blood and treasure of the whole nation, is a gross and palpable violation of the Federal Constitution.

2. Resolved, That Virginia cannot, in honor or in justice to herself or to posterity, think for one moment of submitting to a law of Congress, having for its object an abridgement of the rights secured by the constitution to the slaveholder and to the south; and she will regard the passage of such a law a direct infraction of the Constitution of the United States, and, consequently, a subversion of the equal rights and benefits secured by that instrument alike to all portions of the Union.

3. Resolved, That Virginia will resist such an act of aggression to the last extremity, and by every means which she can command.

4. Resolved, That in the event of the passage, by Congress, of the Wilmot Proviso, or any kindred measure, which can or shall have a practical operation, the interests and rights of the States holding slaves, then, and in that case, if the Legislature shall have adjourned, it shall be the duty of the Governor to convene the General Assembly of this Commonwealth, to take into consideration the said act, as well as the mode and measure of redress.

5. Resolved, That the Governor of the Commonwealth be requested to send a copy of these resolutions to each of the States of this Union, and also to our Senators in Congress and each of the members of the House of Representatives.

From California.

New discoveries of gold are said to have been made in California. It is estimated that about a hundred thousand dollars' worth is gathered daily. The diggers, notwithstanding the immense amount of gold gathered, are in a suffering condition for the necessities of life, and much sickness prevails. Provisions demand almost any price, and two barrels of brandy have been retailed at the mines for fourteen thousand dollars in gold dust.

MANSLAUGHTER BY VACCINATION.—A physician of Pulaski county, Illinois, has been sentenced to the penitentiary for the term of four years and a half, upon a charge of manslaughter, growing out of his vaccinating a man with the small pox matter from the effects of which he died. Particulars not given.

SOMETHING NEW.—The Cincinnati Commercial says that Messrs. Koble & Miller have an establishment in that city, whose whole business, employing some \$10,000 worth of capital, is preparing sausage skins for the European market. They attend all the slaughter-houses, obtain the innards of all the hogs, prepare and then ship them across the Atlantic, realizing a large profit in the transaction.

It may seem right to a man—to attempt to obtain a livelihood without industry and economy, but the end thereof is—hunger and rage.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

Peltons splendid outline Maps, Baldwin's pronouncing Geographical Gazetteer, and "Naylor's system of teaching Geography," for sale by J. Hamblinton of this place. He is also prepared to give instruction to classes, or to individuals who wish to qualify themselves for teaching the science of Geography according to this new, superior, and (where tried) universally approved system. Address by letter or otherwise, Salem, Col., Co. O. Oct. 6th, 1848.

FRUIT TREES.

The proprietor has on hand a handsome lot of FRUIT TREES, comprising Apple, Pear, Peach, Plum, and Cherry trees, and some Grape Vines and Ornamental Trees—all of which he will sell on reasonable terms at his residence in Goshen, Mahoning Co., 4 1/2 miles north-west of Salem.

ZACHARIAH JENKINS, Jr.
Aug. 11, 1848.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE, SALEM, O.

POETRY.

"IF I WERE A VOICE."

If I were a voice, a persuasive voice,
That could travel the wide world through,
I would fly on the beams of the morning light,
And speak to men with a gentle might,
And tell them to be true.
I would fly, I would fly, over land and sea,
Wherever a human heart might be,
Telling a tale or singing a song,
In praise of the Right, in blame of the Wrong.
If I were a voice, a consoling voice,
I'd fly on the wings of air;
The homes of Sorrow and Grief I'd seek,
And calm and useful words I'd speak,
To save them from Despair.
I would fly, I would fly, o'er the guarded town,
And drop, like the beautiful sunlight, down
Into the hearts of suffering men,
And teach them to look up again.
If I were a voice, a convincing voice,
I'd travel with the wind,
And wherever I saw the nation torn
By warfare, jealousy, spite or scorn,
Or hatred of their kind,
I would fly, I would fly on the thunder crash,
And into their blinded bosoms flash;
And, all their evil thoughts subdued,
I'd teach them Christian Brotherhood.
If I were a voice, an immortal voice,
I'd seek the kings of the earth;
I'd find them alone on their beds at night,
And whisper words that should guide them right,
Lessons of priceless worth.
I would fly more swift than the swiftest bird,
And tell them things they never heard—
Truth which the ages for aye repeat—
Unknown to the courtiers at their feet.
If I were a voice, an immortal voice,
I'd speak in the people's ear;
And whenever they shouted "Liberty,"
Without deserving to be free,
I'd make their error clear.
I would fly, I would fly on the wings of day,
Rebuking Wrong on my world-wide way,
And making all the Earth rejoice—
If I were a voice—an immortal voice.

The Slave in the Dismal Swamp.

BY HENRY W. LONGFELLOW.

In dark fens of the Dismal Swamp,
The hunted Negro lay;
He saw the fire of the midnight camp,
And heard at times a horse's tramp,
And a bloodhound's distant bay.
Where will-o'-the-wisps and glowworms shine,
In bulrush and in brake;
Where waving mosses shroud the pine,
And the cedar grows, and the poisonous vine
Is spotted like the snake;
Where hardly a human foot could pass,
Or a human heart would dare,
On the quaking turf of the green morass
He crouched in the rank and tangled grass,
Like a wild beast in his lair.
A poor old slave, infirm and lame;
Great scars deformed his face;
On his forehead he bore the brand of shame,
And the rage, that hid his mangled frame,
Were the signs of disgrace.
All things above were bright and fair,
All things were glad and free;
Larks and quails darted here and there,
And wild birds filled the echoing air
With songs of Liberty!
On him alone was the doom of pain,
From the morning of his birth;
On him alone the curse of Cain
Fell, like a fall on the garnered grain,
And struck him to the earth!

Beautifully Expressed.

No man, however degraded, is utterly beyond reformation. Beautifully by Whittier, in one of his poems, expressed this truth:
"As on the White Sea's charmed shore,
The Parsee sees his holy hill
With dunest smoke-clouds curtained o'er,
Yet knows beneath them evermore,
The low pale fire is quivering still;
So underneath its clouds of sin,
The heart of man retaineth yet,
Gleams of its holy origin;
And half-quenched stars that never set,
Dim color of its faded bow,
And early beauty linger there,
And o'er its wasted desert bloom
Faint breathings of its morning air.
Oh! never yet upon the scroll
Of the sin-stained but priceless soul,
Hath heaven inscribed 'Despair!'
Cast not the clouded gem away,
Quench not the living but dim ray—
My brother man, beware!
With that deep voice which from the skies
Forbade the Patriarch's sacrifice,
God's angel cries 'Forbear!'"

MISCELLANEOUS.

From the Model American Courier.

That John Mason.

BY JOHN JONES, JR.

"What kind of people have you here?" I asked of my acquaintance, after becoming a citizen of the beautiful little village of Moorfield.
"Very clever people, with one or two exceptions," he replied. "I am sure you will like us very well."
"Who are the exceptions?" I asked. "For I wish to keep all such exceptions at a distance. Being a stranger, I will take a hint in time. It's an easy matter to shun acquaintance, but by no means so easy to break it off after it is once formed."
"Very truly said. And I will warn you in time, of one in particular. His name is John Mason. Keep clear of him if you wish to keep clear of trouble. He's smooth and oily as a whetstone, and like a whetstone, abrades everything he touches. He's a bad man, that John Mason!"
"Who, or what is he?" I asked.
"He's a lawyer, and one of the principal holders of property in the township. But money can't blind him over. He's a bad man, that John Mason, and my advice to you and

to every one is to keep clear of him. I know him like a book."

"I'm very much obliged to you," said I; "for your timely caution, and will take care to profit by it."

My next acquaintance bore pretty much the same testimony, and so did the next. It was, that John Mason was not the right kind of a man, and rather a blemish upon the village of Moorfield, notwithstanding he was one of the property holders in the township.

"If it wasn't for John Mason," I heard on this hand, and "if it were not for that John Mason," I heard on the other hand, as my acquaintanceship among the people extended. Particularly against him, was the first individual who had whispered in my ears a friendly caution; and I hardly ever met with him, but he had something to say about "that John Mason."

About six months after my arrival in Moorfield, I attended a public meeting, at which the leading men of the township were present. Most of them were strangers to me. At this meeting I fell in company with a very pleasant man, who had several times addressed those present, and always in such a clear, forcible and common sense way as to carry conviction to all but a few, who carped and quibbled at everything he said, and in a very childish manner. Several of those quibblers I happened to know. He represented one set of views, and they another. He had regard to the public good; their's looked, it was plain, to sectional and private interests.

"How do you like our little town?" said this individual to me, after the meeting had adjourned, and little knots of individuals were gathered here and there for conversation.

"Very well," I replied.
"And the people?" he added.
"The people," I added, "appeared to be about a fair sample of what are found everywhere; good and bad mixed up together."

"Yes," that I suppose, is a good general estimate."
"Of course," I added, "we find in all communities, certain individuals who stand more prominent than the rest—distinguished for good or evil. This appears to be the case here as well as elsewhere."

"You have already discovered then, that even in Moorfield there are some bad men?"
"O, yes! there's that John Mason, for instance."

The man looked a little surprised, but remarked without any change of tone—

"So you have heard of him, have you?"

"Oh, yes."

"Of course. You know him, I suppose?"

"Yes, very well. Have you ever met him?"

"No, and never wish to."

"Never. Is he here?"

The man glanced round the room and said, "I don't see him."

"He was here, I suppose?"

"Oh, yes; and addressed the meeting several times."

"In one of those sneering, ill-tempered answers to your remarks, no doubt."

The man slightly bowed his head, as if acknowledging a compliment.

"It's a pity that such men as this John Mason often have wealth and shrewdness of mind, to give them power in the community," said I.

"Perhaps," said my auditor, "your prejudices against this man are too strong. He's not perfect, I know; but even the devil is often painted blacker than he is. If you knew him—I rather think you would estimate him differently."

"I don't wish to know him. Opportunities have offered, but I have always avoided an introduction."

"Who first gave you the character of this man?"

"Mr. Laxton," I replied. "Do you know him?"

"Oh, yes; very well. He speaks ill of Mason, does he?"

"He has cause, I believe."

"Has he ever explained to you what it was?"

"Not very fully. But he gives him a general bad character, and says he has done more to injure the best interests of the village than any ten of its worst enemies that exist."

"Indeed! That is a sweeping declaration. But I will frankly own that I cannot join in so broad a condemnation of the man, although he has his faults—and no one knows him, I think, better than I do."

This made no impression on me. The name of John Mason was associated, in my mind, with everything that was bad, and I replied by saying that I was well satisfied in regard to his character, and didn't mean to have anything to do with him while I lived in Moorfield.

Some one interrupted our conversation at this point, and I was soon separated from my very agreeable companion. I met him frequently afterwards, and he was always particularly polite to me, and asked me if I had fallen in with John Mason yet; to which I always replied in the negative, and expressed myself freely in regard to the personage mentioned.

Careful as we may be to keep out of trouble, we are not always successful in our efforts. When I removed to Moorfield, I supposed my affairs to be in a good way; but things proved to be otherwise. I was disappointed, not only in the amounts I expected to receive from the business I followed in the village, but in the receipt of money, I felt sure of getting by a certain time.

When I first came to Moorfield, I bought a piece of property from Laxton—(this business transaction made us acquainted)—and paid cash down one-third of the purchase money; the property remaining as security for two-thirds, which I was under contract to settle at a certain time. My first payment was two thousand dollars. Unfortunately, when the final payment became due, I was not in funds, and the prospect of receiving money within five or six months was anything but good. In this dilemma I waited upon Laxton and informed him of my disappointment. His face became grave.

"I hope it will not put you to any serious inconvenience," I said.

"What?" he asked.

"My failure to meet this payment on this property. You are fully secured, and within six months I will be able to do what I had hoped to do at this time."

"I am sorry, Mr. Jones," he returned, "but I have made my calculation to receive the sum due at this time, and cannot do without it."

"But I haven't the money, Mr. Laxton, and have fully explained to you the reason why."

"That is your affair, not mine, Mr. Jones. If you have been disappointed at one point, it is your business to look at another. A contract is a contract."

"Will you not extend the time of this payment?" I said.

"No, sir. I cannot."

"What will you do?"

"Do! You ask a strange question!"

"Well, what will you do?"

"Why, raise the money on the property."

"How will you do that?"

"Sell it, of course."

I asked no further questions, but left him and went away. Before reaching home, to which place I was retreating, in order to think over the position in which I was placed, and determine what steps to take, if any were left to me, I met the pleasant acquaintance I had met at the town meeting.

"You look grave, Mr. Jones," said he, as we passed, facing each other. "What's the matter?"

"I frankly told him my difficulty."

"So Laxton has got you in his clutches, has he?" was the simple, yet I perceived meaning reply that he made.

"I am in his clutches, certainly," said I.

"And will not get out of them very easily, I apprehend."

"What will he do?"

"You cannot be sure."

"He will bring the property at auction."

"It won't bring his claim under the hammer."

"No, I suppose not, for that is really more than the property is worth."

"Do you think so?"

"Certainly I do. I know the value of every lot of ground in the township, and know that you have been taken in, in your purchase."

"What do you suppose it will bring at a forced sale?"

"Few men will bid over twenty-five hundred dollars."

"You cannot be serious."

"I assure you I am. He, however, will overbid all, to four thousand. He will probably have it knocked down to him at three thousand, and thus come into the unnumbered possession of a piece of property upon which he has received two thousand dollars."

"But three thousand dollars will not satisfy his claim against me."

"No. You will still owe him a thousand dollars."

"Will he prosecute his claim?"

"He! and the man smiled. 'Yes, to the last extremity, if there be hope of getting any thing.'"

"Then I am certainly in a bad way."

"I'm afraid you are, unless you can find some one here who will befriended you in the matter."

"There is no one here who will lend me four thousand dollars upon the piece of property."

"I don't know of but one man who is likely to do it," he answered.

"Who is that?" I asked eagerly.

"John Mason."

"John Mason! I'll never go to him."

"Why not?"

"I might as well remain where I am, as to get into his hands. A sharper and a lawyer to boot! No—no. Better to bear the evils that we have, than to fly to others that we know not of."

"You may get assistance somewhere else, but I am doubtful," said the man; and bowing politely, passed on, and left me to my own unpleasant reflections.

Laxton made as quick work of the business as the nature of the case would admit; and in a short time the property was advertised at public sale. As the time for sale approached, the great desire to prevent the sacrifice suggested the "dernier resort" of calling upon Mason. But my prejudice against the man was so strong, that I could not get my own consent to do so.

"Have you been to see Mason?" he asked.

I shook my head.

"Then you have made up your mind to let the seconded, Laxton, fleece you out of your property."

"I see no way of preventing it."

"Why don't you try Mason?"

"I don't believe it would do any good."

"I think differently."

"If he'd help me out of this difficulty," I replied, "it would only be to get me into a more narrow corner."

"You don't know any such thing," said the man, in a different tone from any in which he had yet spoken when Mason was the subject of remark. "Think, for a moment, upon the basis of your prejudice. It lies mainly upon the assertion of Laxton, whom your own experience has proved to be a scoundrel. The fact is, your estimate of Mason's character is entirely erroneous. Laxton hates him, because he has circumvented him more than a dozen times in his schemes of iniquity, and will circumvent him again, if I do not greatly err, provided you apply to him."

There was force in this view. True enough. What confidence was there to be placed in Laxton's words? And if Mason had circumvented him, as was alleged, of course there was a very good reason for detraction.

"At what hour do you think I can see him?" said I.

"I believe he is usually in about twelve o'clock."

"I will see him," said I, with emphasis.

"Do so," said the man; and may your interview be as satisfactory as you can desire."

At twelve precisely, I called upon Mason—not without many misgivings I must own. I found my prejudices still strong as to the good result. I could not help feeling serious doubts. On entering his office, I found no one present but the individual under whose advice I had called.

"Mr. Mason is not in," said I, feeling a little disappointed.

"Oh, yes he is," was replied.

I looked around, and then turned my eyes upon the man's face. I did not exactly comprehend his expression.

"My name is John Mason," said he, bowing politely. "So be seated, and let us talk over the business upon which you called to see me."

I needed no invitation to sit down, for I could not have kept my feet if I had tried, so suddenly and completely did his words astonish and confound me.

I will not repeat the confused blundering apologies I attempted to make, nor give his gentlemanly replies. Enough, that an hour before the time at which the sale was advertised to take place on the next day, I waited upon Laxton.

"Be kind enough," said I, "to let me have that obligation upon which your present stringent measures are founded."

The man looked perfectly blank.

"Mr. John Mason," said I, "has generously furnished me with the funds necessary to save my property from sacrifice, and will take the securities you hold."

"Curse that John Mason!" ejaculated Laxton, with excessive bitterness, turning away abruptly, and leaving me where I stood. A suspicion that he meant to let the sale go on, if possible, crossed my mind, and I returned to Mason, who saw the sheriff, and had the whole matter arranged.

Laxton has never spoken to me since.—As for "that John Mason," I have proved him to be a fast friend, and a man of strict honor in everything.—So much for SLANDER.

From the Nonpareil.

Foot-Prints in the Snow.

BY MISS MARTHA RUSSELL.

The first glance through the frost-pictured window-panes, this morning, showed us that the air-spirits had been busy, while we slept, weaving with restless fingers, a snowy covering for disrobed, disrowned, Mother Earth. The sky had still a grayish, leaden hue, and occasionally the air was darkened by a shower of flurries, as if those same mischievous spirits were pelting each other with snow-balls, after their task was done, like mischievous school-boys; or, perchance, they were scattered by loving hands, to deepen the stainless covering that folds the buds of Spring's earliest darlings—the blue-eyed violets.

While the fire burns brightly in the old—alas! the power of early habit. That old fireplace is dark and dreary as the heart of the first inventor of stoves! In the good old days men were wont to swear by their homes and their hearth-stones. But ours are no more!

What wonder that patriotism has become degraded to the utterance of mere party Shibboleths. Who feels his blood kindle at the thought of danger to his—"Air-tight," "Cylinder," or any other of the tribe—for their name is Legion! Who would die in defence of hardware!

What wonder that religion grows cold and formal when our household lilies are de-throned, and their places usurped by shapeless, uncouth masses of iron, ugly enough to represent the whole mythology of the Boodhist!

Think you that he who walked this earth in his singing garments, "among us, but not of us"—the ethereal-minded Shelley—had the remotest reference to stoves, when he exclaimed,

"Men scarcely know how beautiful fire is! Each flame of it is as a precious stone. Dissolved in ever-moving light, and this belongs to each and all who gaze upon."

I opine not, for in these days its "moving light" belongs to no one. Having uttered our protest against the "darkness visible" that has extinguished the once cheerful light on our hearth-stones, let us turn to the window, and watch the changes in the world without. Jack Frost's daggerian sketches on the window-panes are fading away, and we can get a clearer view than before.

The snow lies deep and unbroken—stainless as a maiden's truth are the teachings of the world have sullied it. The trunks and branches of the trees, on the northern side, are covered with a coating of snow. They show a cold shoulder to the north wind as those who whistle among them, whirling the snow in deep eddies around their roots; then away he goes down by the river, waiting with the little sleds; or pause on the bleak hill-side, to dance a polka with your maiden sweet-briar, crowned with her chaplet of scarlet berries.

Look at your range of snow-drifts! Architecture, mouldings, cornices, arches, and capitals—Corinthian, Ionian, Doric, and Gothic—all are more or less distinctly represented. We go to Europe, and gaze with hushed reverence on the manifestations of that imperishable genius that made ancient Greece one vast temple of beauty; we talk enthusiastically, and perhaps learnedly, of her temples, and return home only to find the genius and architecture of all those wonders folded beneath the winter-sky of bleak New England.

Then comes the first foot-prints in our street. A man, wrapped in overcoat and comforter, toils along, stepping high and wide. What a ridiculous gate that would be for a day in July. Now he reaches the corner, and stops. A deep drift barricades the way, from behind which old Boreas sends a whole shower of snow in his face and eyes, and impudently whisks off his hat for a foot-ball. Ha! he has it again. His Yankee blood is stirred, and grasping the brim with both hands, he makes a dive, and disappears round the corner.

Here comes another. See how exactly he steps in the tracks of his predecessor. Had the first pedestrian possessed the stride of the "Colossus at Rhodes," every man that came after would have attempted to step in his foot-prints. Any one who has paid the slightest attention to the manners and habits of our New England population, could not have failed to notice this propensity of the gentlemen to track each other in the snow, while, on the other hand, the women, if they have occasion to go out before the paths are beaten, as invariably choose their own paths; or, as a little friend of mine said when told to step in the tracks of the older children, "they prefer making their own tracks."

Here comes farmer H— with a sled load of school children. How cheerily their voices sound. One little fellow stands up and holds on to a stake with a laughable assumption of manly indifference. He feels, at least, a dozen years older than his playmate, who sits by his sister's side, and clings with both hands to the beam. In the broad smooth track left by the sled-runners, a bright-eyed boy comes sliding along, drawing a miniature sled after him. There, the string has broke! But Yankee-like, he is not without resources. He draws off his mittens, (how vividly they remind us of that first pair, knit for us by the fingers of a dear old grandmother,) and begins to unload his pockets. A ball, comb, knife, pin-box, broken pencils, half a dozen walnuts, a piece of chalk, a broken gimblet—quite a respectable museum is collected on his sled before he comes to the snarl of "wax-ends," tow strings, and shop-twines, which, perchance his admiration for the character of Ben, in Miss Edgeworth's story of "Waste not, Want not," has led him to hoard up. A few moments suffice to remedy the accident, and he is off to overtake his school mates.

There comes a sleigh round the corner.—Eq. C— has picked up all the children

(we trust those bright-eyed girls, with cheeks mocking the cherry-colored lining of their hoods, will not take offence at the word) in his neighborhood. Boys and girls blue, black, hazel, and gray-eyed are huddled together, laughing, chatting and chirping to the old white horse. But the cunning old fellow pretends to be deaf, though it is easy to see by the quick motion of his ears, that he hears every word. He keeps on his slow, even step, as if conscious that he is a far better judge of the state of the road than those young heads. Occasionally he feels the pressure of the bit pauses in front of a house and stands blowing a cloud of breath from his nostrils, while his master discusses the price of potatoes with the farmer and his boys, who are out making paths. We country people are said to lack politeness, but see, how the Squire turns out into deep drift to let those girls pass. Tomorrow, perchance, he will visit the city and be laughed at by young ladies whose fathers would be on the bankrupt list, were it not for him and others of his class. He will care little for that, but it will be long before he forgets the bright smiles with which these young girls thank him for his thoughtful kindness. They will brighten the whole day.

There goes uncle J—'s team. He is out of wood, I will wager, for there has not been a snow-storm these twenty years, that has not caught him in the same predicament. "Right my luck," the old man will say; but a little more energy and forethought would act like a charm in his case, as well as many others."

The stir of life increases. The village common, on which, a few hours since, the snow lay, a pure, unbroken sheet, has now the look of a morris board, crossed by a dozen different tracks, all converging toward the same focus—the store door. Before night-fall there will be paths leading to every home in the village.

In the meantime let us turn within and read—nay, not Agassiz's "Glacial Theory," E—, "We will have no 'Ice Periods' today, though Heaven knows we have felt their chilling influence often enough in our fragment of a life. Give us gentle 'Ellia,' or better still, John Keats' Poems, and we will conjure up a dream of summer, deepened almost to reality by yon stand of flowers, and the low hum of grandmother's fliers as she turns her wheel.

Hark! the bell is tolling. Said we not there would be paths leading to every home before night fall? Solemnly and slowly it sends its voice over hill-side and dale, startling the dwellers in the distant farm-houses with its mournful message, and calling forth many a heart-felt expression of sympathy for the young couple who are about to bury their first-born.

We little thought, sweet Mary W—, when last we saw thee, some eight days ago, playing 'bo-peep' with thy baby brother, hiding thy sunny eyes and sunny hair in the folds of thy mother's dress, that the first snow of winter would fall upon thy open grave.—"Sorrowful even unto death," are the hearts of mourners beneath the sky of summer, but who shall paint the agony of those young parents' hearts when they saw that dead head, that had known no harder pillow than a mother's bosom, laid down in the frozen grave!

But, blessed be His holy name, while the deep yearnings of Nature tempt them to rush forward and snatch their darling from that dreary pillow, Faith whispers, "She is not here, but is risen."

Now they are all gone. The trampled snow and that small hillock of brown earth—the last visible foot-print of the child-angel—are all the traces that remain to mark the wide-spread struggle between Life and Death. Yon load of merry sleighers will pass by without heeding them, but oh! how many, many times during the dreary night, will that young mother's heart return to that little grave in the churchyard; how many, many bitter struggles ere she can truly say, "Thy will be done!"

The Cholera.

Our city was rife yesterday with rumors of the presence of Cholera, and some excitement was manifested on the subject.—The most careful enquiries assure us that so far, no case of Cholera has yet been brought hither, nor has any occurred here.

But while we deny that Cholera has yet appeared in Pittsburgh, it is only reasonable to suppose that it may visit us, and that very soon. Another day—a week, may not appear until we shall have the most convincing proofs of its presence. There is in this nothing to excite alarm. Experience has shown that the disease is perfectly manageable, yields readily to treatment, if carefully watched, and medical aid brought to the first symptom.

The common error, and the fatal one which has wrought the terrible mortality in the progress of Cholera, is that of regarding the "premonitory symptom" of Cholera, diarrhoea, as a mere symptom of the approach of the disease, when, in fact, it is the disease itself.

Let the person attacked but bear in mind, when Cholera is prevailing, that the occurrence of this diarrhoea—with or without pain in the attack of Cholera, and not a warning; then call in his medical attendant instantly, and it will be found that this dreaded pestilence is disarmed of all its terrors.—Thus treated, it yields promptly to simple remedies, and is found to be rarely fatal.

In all our investigations, running through the whole period since the appearance of Cholera last year in Russia, pursued with a view to publications on the subject for the common information and benefit, the views we have here stated have been more and more warranted at every step, by the concurrence of testimony to the effect that, whenever a case has terminated fatally in which the proper treatment had been pursued, it invariably resulted, on strict examination, that the patient had neglected the so-called "premonitory symptom," the disease in fact, until it had assumed a desperate aspect.

Let there be no alarm then, fear kills more than Cholera. For the sake of the lesson let the reader recall the story we told lately, which ran nearly in this wise: A traveler met the Plague entering a city of Asia, and asked him what he was going to do. I am going to kill 3000 persons. Some time after the same traveler met the Plague going away from the city, and reproached him for his falsehood: "You told me you were going to kill three thousand persons, but you have killed thirty thousand." "I told you truly," rejoined the Plague, "I killed but

3000, fear killed the rest